

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

New drawings 3D-3I are provided herewith in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(d). Such drawing sheets are intended to illustrate features described in the specification and recited in pending Claim 8. No new matter has been added.

Additionally, the originally-filed informal drawings have been replaced with formal drawing sheets.

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. Claims 1-6 and 9-35 have been rejected and Claims 7-8 have been objected to by the Examiner. Claims 1-2, 6, 9-10, 12-13, 15-16, 19-20, 25, and 28-30 have been amended, and Claim 5 has been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, Claims 1-4 and 6-35 will be pending in the present application upon entry of this Amendment and Reply.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

On page 18 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 7-8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and that Claim 21 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. At this time, Claims 7-8 and 21 have not been amended to include all of the limitations of their base and intervening claims. The Applicants submit that such claims are also allowable by virtue of their dependency on claims that are allowable for additional reasons, as will be described in greater detail below.

**Specification**

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure. Appropriate correction has been made, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

**Drawings**

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as not showing every feature specified in Claim 8. New drawing Figures 3D-3I have been submitted herewith, and new paragraphs [0019A]-[0019F] have been added to the specification. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

New formal drawing sheets have also been submitted for the remaining drawings originally filed with the present application. Consideration and acceptance of such drawings is respectfully requested.

**Claim Objections**

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claim 13. Appropriate correction has been made in accordance with the suggestion of the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 16, 19-22, and 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 16, 19-20, and 28-30 have been amended to address the Examiner's concerns, to more clearly recite the recited claim language, and/or to delete redundant claim language. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 16, 19-22, and 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102**

**1. Claims 1-6, 13, 15, 17-20, and 25-32 (Owings et al.)**

On page 4 of the Office Action, Claims 1-6, 13, 15, 17-20, and 25-32 were rejected in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,050,003 to Owings et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is in independent form and recites an “attachment for selective coupling to a rotary cutting tool” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “base coupled to the body for adjusting the depth of cut of the rotary cutting tool that is selectively adjustable between an extended position and a retracted position relative to the body.”

Owings et al. does not identically disclose an “attachment for selective coupling to a rotary cutting tool” comprising, among other elements, a “base coupled to the body for adjusting the depth of cut of the rotary cutting tool that is selectively adjustable between an extended position and a retracted position relative to the body” as recited in independent Claim 1. For example, the “member 28” identified by the Examiner as a “base” in Owings et al. is actually a “latch member 28” that “extends into the slot 32 to prevent accidental uncoupling of the system” (Owings et al., column 3, lines 8-9). Owings et al. does not disclose that the “latch member 28” is provided “for adjusting the depth of cut of” a rotary cutting tool, as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 (and its associated dependent claims) is patentable over Owings et al.

Claim 15 is in independent form and recites a “rotary cutting tool system” in which “the rotary cutting tool may be operated in a first mode of operation such that the first attachment is coupled to the housing and a second mode of operation without an attachment coupled thereto wherein the first attachment is removed from the rotary cutting tool.”

Owings et al. does not identically disclose a “rotary cutting tool system” in which “the rotary cutting tool may be operated in a first mode of operation such that the first attachment is coupled to the housing and a second mode of operation without an attachment coupled thereto wherein the first attachment is removed from the rotary cutting tool” as recited in independent Claim 15. In contrast, if the “power handle 12” of Owings et al. is detached from the “tool head 14,” the “tool head 14” will not operate, since the “power handle 12” includes “batteries” that “power the motor.” Accordingly, Claim 15 (and its associated dependent claims) is patentable over Owings et al.

Claim 25 is in independent form and recites a “rotary cutting tool adapted for operation in one of at least two different modes of operation” in which “a second of said at

least two different modes of operation” results “when the first attachment is removed from the housing so that a user may grasp the tool housing without an attachment coupled thereto.”

Owings et al. does not identically disclose a “rotary cutting tool adapted for operation in one of at least two different modes of operation” in which “a second of said at least two different modes of operation” results “when the first attachment is removed from the housing so that a user may grasp the tool housing without an attachment coupled thereto” as recited in independent Claim 25. In contrast, if the “power handle 12” of Owings et al. is detached from the “tool head 14,” the “tool head 14” will not operate, since the “power handle 12” includes “batteries” that “power the motor.” Claim 25 (and its associated dependent claims) is patentable over Owings et al.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-6, 13, 15, 17-20, and 25-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

**2. Claims 1-3, 5, 13-15, 17-20, 22-30, and 32-34 (Kopras)**

On page 7 of the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 5, 13-15, 17-20, 22-30, and 32-34 were rejected in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,813,805 to Kopras under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is in independent form and recites an “attachment for selective coupling to a rotary cutting tool” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “a base coupled to the body for adjusting the depth of cut of the rotary cutting tool that is selectively adjustable between an extended position and a retracted position relative to the body.”

Kopras does not identically disclose an “attachment for selective coupling to a rotary cutting tool” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “a base coupled to the body for adjusting the depth of cut of the rotary cutting tool that is selectively adjustable between an extended position and a retracted position relative to the body” as recited in independent Claim 1. For example, the Examiner noted that “‘base’ 46 is adjustable between ‘extended’ and ‘retracted’ positions relative to the aforescribed ‘body’.” However, the element in Kopras referred to the Examiner is not coupled to the body as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Claim 1 (and its associated dependent claims) is patentable over Kopras.

Claim 15 is in independent form and recites a “rotary cutting tool system” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “a first attachment adapted to be selectively coupled to the housing, the first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface having a size sufficient to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool.”

Kopras does not identically disclose a “rotary cutting tool system” comprising, among other elements, a “a handle portion having a gripping surface having a size sufficient to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool” as recited in independent Claim 15. At the outset, it should be noted that in contrast to the subject matter recited in Claim 15, Kopras clearly discloses at column 5, lines 48-53 (with emphasis added):

The handle 14 includes a gripping surface 59 which is preferably contoured in shape so that the handle 14 may be comfortably grasped in the hand of an operator of the cutting tool 10. The handle gripping surface 59 is aligned substantially parallel with the axis of the cutting tool housing 12.

Thus, Kopras does not disclose, teach, or suggest, a gripping surface that is substantially parallel to the central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool. However, the Examiner stated that “any of the surface of the handle 14 that are exposed when the handle 14 is attached to the housing 12 are available to be gripped by a user” and drew fingers on a portion of the handle to illustrate this point. Despite the fact that this construction of the claim term “gripping surface” does not accurately represent how one of ordinary skill in the art would understand its usage, and despite the fact that Kopras describes only one portion of the handle as being a “gripping surface” (not the portion on which fingers were drawn), the Applicants have nevertheless amended the language used in Claim 15 to more clearly recite the meaning of the term “gripping surface.” Accordingly, the Applicants submit that Claim 15 (and its associated dependent claims) is patentable over Kopras.

Claim 25 is in independent form and recites a “rotary cutting tool adapted for operation in one of at least two different modes of operation” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface configured to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of a tool bit when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool.”

Kopras does not identically disclose a “rotary cutting tool adapted for operation in one of at least two different modes of operation” comprising, among other elements, a “first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface configured to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of a tool bit when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool” as recited in independent Claim 25. Claim 25 (and its associated dependent claims) is patentable over Kopras.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-3, 5, 13-15, 17-20, 22-30, and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

**3. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9, 13, 15, 17, 19-20, 25-26, and 28-30 (Wolff)**

On page 9 of the Office Action, Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9, 13, 15, 17, 19-20, 25-26, and 28-30 were rejected in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,572,715 to Wolff under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is in independent form and recites an “attachment for selective coupling to a rotary cutting tool” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “body comprising a handle having a size sufficient to accommodate an entire palm of a power tool user that is substantially perpendicular to a central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool when the attachment is coupled to the rotary cutting tool.”

Wolff does not identically disclose an “attachment for selective coupling to a rotary cutting tool” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “body comprising a handle having a size sufficient to accommodate an entire palm of a power tool user that is substantially perpendicular to a central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool when the

attachment is coupled to the rotary cutting tool” as recited in independent Claim 1. For example, the “hand operating levers 12” disclosed in Wolff are not of sufficient size to accommodate an entire palm of a power tool user. Claim 1 (and its associated dependent claims) is patentable over Wolff.

Claim 15 is in independent form and recites a “rotary cutting tool system” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “a first attachment adapted to be selectively coupled to the housing, the first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface having a size sufficient to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool.”

Wolff does not identically disclose a “rotary cutting tool system” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “a first attachment adapted to be selectively coupled to the housing, the first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface having a size sufficient to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool” as recited in independent Claim 15. Claim 15 (and its associated dependent claims) is patentable over Wolff.

Claim 25 is in independent form and recites a “rotary cutting tool adapted for operation in one of at least two different modes of operation” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface configured to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of a tool bit when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool.”

Wolff does not identically disclose a “rotary cutting tool adapted for operation in one of at least two different modes of operation” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface configured to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of a tool bit when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary



cutting tool” as recited in independent Claim 25. Claim 25 (and its associated dependent claims) is patentable over Wolff.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9, 13, 15, 17, 19-20, 25-26, and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

**4. Claims 1-6, 9-15, 17-20, 22-23, 25-30, and 32-33 (PCT '182)**

On page 11 of the Office Action, Claims 1-6, 9-15, 17-20, 22-23, 25-30, and 32-33 were rejected in view of PCT WO 02/04182 (“PCT '182”) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Applicants note that PCT '182 is improperly noted by the Examiner as being prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), although it may be prior art under another section of 35 U.S.C. § 102 (i.e., the present application claims priority to a U.S. provisional application that was filed on January 8, 2003). Accordingly, the Applicants will address the PCT '182 reference here and in the other sections of this response under the assumption that the reference had been cited under the appropriate section of 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claim 1 is in independent form and recites an “attachment for selective coupling to a rotary cutting tool” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “body comprising a handle having a size sufficient to accommodate an entire palm of a power tool user that is substantially perpendicular to a central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool when the attachment is coupled to the rotary cutting tool.”

PCT '182 does not identically disclose an “attachment for selective coupling to a rotary cutting tool” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “body comprising a handle having a size sufficient to accommodate an entire palm of a power tool user that is substantially perpendicular to a central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool when the attachment is coupled to the rotary cutting tool” as recited in independent Claim 1. In contrast, PCT '182 expressly discloses in paragraph [0030] (with emphasis added):

Handle 24 also includes a gripping surface 26 which is preferably contoured in shape so that the handle 24 may be grasped comfortably in the hand of an operator of cutting tool

10. Handle gripping surface 26 is preferably aligned substantially parallel with the axis of motor housing 14.

Thus, PCT '182 does not disclose, teach, or suggest a handle that is handle having a size sufficient to accommodate an entire palm of a power tool user that is substantially perpendicular to a central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool when the attachment is coupled to the rotary cutting tool” as recited in independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 (and its associated dependent claims) is patentable over PCT '182.

Claim 15 is in independent form and recites a “rotary cutting tool system” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “a first attachment adapted to be selectively coupled to the housing, the first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface having a size sufficient to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool.”

PCT '182 does not identically disclose a “rotary cutting tool system” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “a first attachment adapted to be selectively coupled to the housing, the first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface having a size sufficient to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool” as recited in independent Claim 15. Claim 15 (and its associated dependent claims) is patentable over PCT '182.

Claim 25 is in independent form and recites a “rotary cutting tool adapted for operation in one of at least two different modes of operation” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface configured to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of a tool bit when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool.”

PCT '182 does not identically disclose a “rotary cutting tool adapted for operation in one of at least two different modes of operation” comprising, in combination with other

elements, a “first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface configured to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of a tool bit when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool” as recited in independent Claim 25. Claim 25 (and its associated dependent claims) is patentable over PCT ‘182.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-6, 9-15, 17-20, 22-23, 25-30, and 32-33.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

**1. Claims 14, 23-24, and 33-34 (Owings et al. and Kopras)**

On page 13 of the Office Action, Claims 14, 23-24, and 33-34 were rejected in view of Owings et al. and Kopras under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 (from which Claim 14 depends) is in independent form and recites an “attachment for selective coupling to a rotary cutting tool” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “base coupled to the body for adjusting the depth of cut of the rotary cutting tool that is selectively adjustable between an extended position and a retracted position relative to the body.”

Neither Owings et al. nor Kopras, taken alone or in proper combination, teach or suggest an “attachment” that includes “a base coupled to the body for adjusting the depth of cut of the rotary cutting tool that is selectively adjustable between an extended position and a retracted position relative to the body.” Claim 14 is therefore patentable over the combination of Owings et al. and Kopras.

Claim 15 (from which Claims 23-24 depend) is in independent form and recites a “rotary cutting tool system” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “first attachment including a . . . gripping surface having a size sufficient to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool . . . wherein the rotary cutting tool may be operated in a first mode of

operation such that the first attachment is coupled to the housing and a second mode of operation without an attachment coupled thereto wherein the first attachment is removed from the rotary cutting tool.”

Neither Owings et al. nor Kopras, taken alone or in proper combination, teach or suggest a “rotary cutting tool system” having all elements recited in Claim 15. For example, the “tool head 14” of Owings et al. will not operate without the “power handle 12” attached thereto, and Kopras does not teach or suggest a gripping surface including all limitations recited in Claim 15. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in either reference as to how the “power handle 12” of Owings et al. could be utilized in conjunction with the tool disclosed in Kopras. Such a combination would require further modification that not taught or suggested by the cited references. Claims 23-24 are therefore patentable over the combination of Owings et al. and Kopras.

Claim 25 (from which Claims 33-34 depend) is in independent form and recites a “rotary cutting tool adapted for operation in one of at least two different modes of operation” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface configured to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of a tool bit when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool . . . a first of said at least two different modes of operation resulting when the first attachment is coupled to the housing so that a user may grasp the handle portion of the first attachment and a second of said at least two different modes of operation resulting when the first attachment is removed from the housing so that a user may grasp the tool housing without an attachment coupled thereto.”

Neither Owings et al. nor Kopras, taken alone or in proper combination, teach or suggest a “rotary cutting tool” having all elements recited in Claim 25. As described above with respect to Claim 15, there is no teaching or suggestion in either reference as to how the “power handle 12” of Owings et al. could be utilized in conjunction with the tool disclosed in Kopras. Such a combination would require further modification that not taught or suggested by the cited references. Claims 33-34 are therefore patentable over the combination of Owings et al. and Kopras.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 14, 23-24, and 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**2. Claims 16 and 35 (Kopras)**

On page 14 of the Office Action, Claims 16 and 35 were rejected in view of Kopras under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 15 (from which Claim 16 depends) is in independent form and recites a “rotary cutting tool system” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “first attachment including a . . . gripping surface having a size sufficient to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool.”

As described above, Kopras does not teach or suggest a “first attachment” that includes a “gripping surface having a size sufficient to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool” as recited in Claim 15. Claim 16 is therefore patentable over Kopras.

Claim 25 (from which Claim 35 depends) is in independent form and recites a “rotary cutting tool” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface configured to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of a tool bit when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool.”

As described above, Kopras does not teach or suggest a “first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface configured to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of a tool bit when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool” as recited in Claim 15. Claim 35 is therefore patentable over Kopras.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 16 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**3. Claims 16 and 35 (Wolff)**

On page 14 of the Office Action, Claims 16 and 35 were rejected in view of Wolff under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 15 (from which Claim 16 depends) is in independent form and recites a “rotary cutting tool system” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “first attachment including a . . . gripping surface having a size sufficient to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool.”

As described above, Wolff does not teach or suggest a “first attachment” that includes a “gripping surface having a size sufficient to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool” as recited in Claim 15. Claim 16 is therefore patentable over Wolff.

Claim 25 (from which Claim 35 depends) is in independent form and recites a “rotary cutting tool” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface configured to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of a tool bit when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool.”

As described above, Wolff does not teach or suggest a “first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface configured to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of a tool bit when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool” as recited in Claim 25. Claim 35 is therefore patentable over Wolff.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 16 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**4. Claims 16 and 35 (PCT '182)**

On page 15 of the Office Action, Claims 16 and 35 were rejected in view of PCT '182 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 15 (from which Claim 16 depends) is in independent form and recites a “rotary cutting tool system” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “first attachment including a . . . gripping surface having a size sufficient to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool.”

As described above, PCT '182 does not teach or suggest a “first attachment” that includes a “gripping surface having a size sufficient to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool” as recited in Claim 15. Claim 16 is therefore patentable over PCT '182.

Claim 25 (from which Claim 35 depends) is in independent form and recites a “rotary cutting tool” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface configured to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of a tool bit when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool.”

As described above, PCT '182 does not teach or suggest a “first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface configured to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of a tool bit when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool” as recited in Claim 25. Claim 35 is therefore patentable over PCT '182.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 16 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**5. Claims 24 and 34 (PCT '182 and Kopras)**

On page 16 of the Office Action, Claims 24 and 34 were rejected in view of PCT '182 and Kopras under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 15 (from which Claim 24 depends) is in independent form and recites a “rotary cutting tool system” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “first attachment including a . . . gripping surface having a size sufficient to accommodate the entire palm of a

power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool.”

Neither PCT ‘182 nor Kopras, taken alone or in proper combination, teaches or suggests a “first attachment” that includes a “gripping surface having a size sufficient to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool” as recited in Claim 15. Claim 16 is therefore patentable over the combination of PCT ‘182 and Kopras.

Claim 25 (from which Claim 34 depends) is in independent form and recites a “rotary cutting tool” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface configured to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of a tool bit when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool.”

Neither PCT ‘182 nor Kopras, taken alone or in proper combination, teaches or suggests a “first attachment including a handle portion having a gripping surface configured to accommodate the entire palm of a power tool user provided substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of a tool bit when the first attachment is coupled to the housing of the rotary cutting tool” as recited in Claim 25. Claim 35 is therefore patentable over PCT ‘182 and Kopras.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 24 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**6. Claims 9-11 (Kopras or Wolff and in view of Fuchs et al.)**

On page 17 of the Office Action, Claims 9-11 were rejected in view of either Kopras et al. or Wolff and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,293,915 to Fuchs et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 (from which Claims 9-11 depend) is in independent form and recites an “attachment for selective coupling to a rotary cutting tool” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “body comprising a handle having a size sufficient to accommodate an



entire palm of a power tool user that is substantially perpendicular to a central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool when the attachment is coupled to the rotary cutting tool.”

Neither Kopras nor Wolff, taken alone or in proper combination, teach or suggest a “body comprising a handle having a size sufficient to accommodate an entire palm of a power tool user that is substantially perpendicular to a central longitudinal axis of the rotary cutting tool when the attachment is coupled to the rotary cutting tool” as recited in Claim 1. Fuchs et al. also does not teach or suggest such an arrangement. For example, Fuchs et al. discloses two “handles 4” that are (as shown in Figure 1) oriented parallel to the central longitudinal axis of the milling machine disclosed therein. Accordingly, Claims 9-11 are allowable over the combination of Kopras et al. or Wolff in view of Fuchs et al.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

\* \* \*


It is submitted that each outstanding objection and rejection to the Application has been overcome, and that the Application is in a condition for allowance. The Applicants request consideration and allowance of all pending claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 2/27/2005

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 26371  
Telephone: (313) 234-7150  
Facsimile: (313) 234-2800

Marcus W. Sprow  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 48,580